

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 7, 15, 16, 24 and 26 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled.

Claim Objections

Claims 7, 16, and 26 were objected to because of a misplaced comma. These claims have been amended to remove the comma, thus overcoming the objection to the claims.

Claim 15 was objected to because the term “currently” should read current. The claim has been amended accordingly, thus overcoming the objection to claim 15 as well as the objection of claims 16-23 by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 3-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 112. Claim 3 has been amended to remove the indefinite element, thus overcoming the 35 USC § 112 rejection of claims 3-14.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,166,688 to Cromer (“Cromer”).

For a 35 U.S.C. §102 reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. Section 2131 of the MPEP recites: “A claim is anticipated only if each and

every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

With respect to amended independent claim 1, Applicant teaches and claims: “A mobile system, comprising: a host chipset; a locator subsystem connected to the host chipset and arranged to determine a current location of the mobile system; and a main storage connected to the host chipset and arranged to store an operating system (OS) and contain an OS-Present application and/or a Pre-OS application configured to enforce system login security policies during user authentication, to access the locator subsystem and determine whether the mobile system may have been stolen or used inappropriately based on the current location of the mobile system and the system login security policies.”

Cromer discloses a portable computer including hardware to determine if the computer has moved outside of an authorized geographical area. The authorized area may not be modified unless: 1) a user provides a privileged access password; or 2) a server computer provides a privileged access password. Thus, if a user wants to change the authorized geographical area that the computer may be operated within, the user must first enter the password. Alternately, the user may pass through a gate, at which time the computer’s information is transmitted to a server, which may provide an updated access area and a password allowing modification of the access area. Col. 3, line 22 – Col. 4 line 16. See also: Abstract; Col. 1, lines 7-15; Col. 2, lines 28-31; Col. 2, lines 33-49; Col. 5, lines 53-57.

Cromer does not disclose system login authentication or system login security policies. Furthermore, Cromer does not disclose determining whether a mobile system may have been stolen or used inappropriately based on the system login security policies.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Cromer does not anticipate all elements of independent claim 1, and this claim is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner alternatively rejected claims 1-2 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness:

“First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” In re Vaech, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), 8th Edition, August 2001, §2143.

There is no suggestion or motivation to modify Cromer to include determining whether a mobile system may have been stolen or used inappropriately based on the system login security policies. Cromer is not directed at preventing unauthorized users from logging onto and using a system. Cromer is only directed at preventing a system from being used in an unauthorized location, and also preventing a user from making an unauthorized change to the system’s location settings.

If the system of Cromer is located outside of an authorized area, it is deemed stolen and immediately disabled. There is no further need for Cromer to make a determination based on the system login security policies, because once the system moves outside of the designated area, it is disabled. See Col. 3, lines 34-39.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for claim 1, and that this claim is in condition for allowance.

Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,162 to Angelo (“Angelo”).

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Angelo, and further in view of Hadfield (Lee Hadfield, Dave Hater, Dave Bixler, “Windows NT Server 4 Security Handbook”, 1997, ISBN: 078971213) (“Hadfield”).

Claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Angelo, Hadfield, and U.S. Patent No. 6,438,690 to Patel (“Patel”), and further in view of Rainbow Technologies.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Angelo, Hadfield, Patel, and Rainbow Technologies, and further in view of Cotichini.

Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Angelo, Hadfield, and Patel, and further in view of Cotichini.

Claims 2-13 are dependent on claim 1. For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for claims 2-13, and thus these claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 15, 21-22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Rainbow Technologies (Rainbow Technologies, “Protecting Laptops with iKey and Intel Protected Access Architecture”) (“Rainbow Technologies”).

Pending independent claims 15 and 24 recite limitations that are similar to the limitations of claim 1, although some differences may exist among the limitations of these pending independent claims. For the same reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify Cromer to include determining whether a mobile system may have been stolen or used inappropriately based on the system login security policies. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for claims 15 and 24.

Claims 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Rainbow Technologies, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,863 to Cotichini (“Cotichini”).

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Rainbow Technologies and further in view of Hadfield.

Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Rainbow Technologies and further in view of Hadfield and Patel.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Rainbow Technologies and Hadfield and Patel.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Rainbow Technologies in view of U.S. Pub. 20020194500 to Bajikar (“Bajikar”).

Claims 21-23 and claims 25-26 are dependent upon independent claims 15 and 24, respectively. For the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 15 and 24, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for claims 21-23 and 25-26.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the applicable rejections have been overcome and that claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees or believes that further discussion will expedite prosecution of this case, the examiner is invited to telephone applicants' representative at the number indicated below.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Kenyon and Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: December 4, 2006

/Cyndi M. Wheeler, Reg. No. 58,156/

Cyndi M. Wheeler
Registration No. 58,156

Intel Corporation
M/S FM6-03
1900 Prairie City Rd.
Folsom, CA 95630
(916) 356-5358